

Phase Diagram of a Lattice Microemulsion Model in Two Dimensions

Per Arne Slotte

Gruppe for teoretisk fysikk

Institutt for fysikk — NTH

N-7034 Trondheim

Norway

The phase diagram of a lattice microemulsion model proposed by Ciach, Høye and Stell [1,2] is studied using mean-field theory and Monte Carlo simulations. Surfactant directional degrees of freedom are summed out exactly before mean-field theory is applied, and the resulting phase diagrams are much improved compared with previous mean-field results. The critical line and tricritical point is located using Monte Carlo simulations and finite size scaling.

I. INTRODUCTION

Oil, water, and surfactant mixtures exhibit very special properties that makes them interesting from a practical as well as from a theoretical point of view. Under certain circumstances they form microemulsions — phases in which microscopic oil- and water-occupied regions are separated by thin layers of surfactant. The characteristic length scale of this structure is typically much larger than the “natural” length scale determined from the particle interactions, while still microscopic.

This paper discusses the phase diagram of the two-dimensional version of a lattice model for a three-component microemulsion system proposed by Ciach, Høye and Stell [1,2], and studied in subsequent papers [3,4,5,6,7,8]. In the following I will refer to this model as the CHS model. Figure 1(a)–(c) shows the three types of phase diagram topologies that is expected [4,7,8] for different surfactant strengths. In the following I will refer to these phase diagram topologies as type A, B and C respectively. The phase diagrams are given in the temperature/surfactant-chemical-potential plane for equal oil/water chemical potentials. With a weak surfactant, the phase diagram is of the simple three-component type shown in figure 1(a), with two regions, disordered and oil/water coexistence, separated by a line of continuous transitions which changes into a first-order line at a tricritical point. When the surfactant is strong, there are two main possibilities shown in figure 1(b) and (c). Both diagrams have four regions: disordered, microemulsion, oil/water coexistence, and ordered structured phases (incommensurate, layered, bicontinuous ...). The disordered- and microemulsion regions are separated by a Lifshitz line [9,10] where the peak in the water–water structure function moves away from zero wave vector, and not by a phase transition. Note that some workers use the term disorder line for the Lifshitz line. I use here the nomenclature of Gompper and Schick [10], which discriminates between the Lifshitz line, and the disorder line at which the asymptotic decay of the water–water correlation function changes from monotonic to nonmonotonic. In phase diagrams of type B, the disordered region is separated from the oil/water coexistence region by a line of continuous phase transitions.

The transition changes into first order at a tricritical point. The Lifshitz line intersects the first-order line, and thus we have the characteristic oil/water/microemulsion coexistence observed experimentally in many systems. The microemulsion is separated from the ordered structured phases by lines of phase transitions that may be either continuous or first order. In phase diagrams of type C, the line separating disordered from oil/water coexistence is always a line of continuous phase transitions, and the line ends at a Lifshitz point where it intersects the Lifshitz line. Thus there is no oil/water/microemulsion coexistence. The microemulsion is separated from an ordered structured phase by a line of continuous transitions near the Lifshitz point, but the transition may be of any order elsewhere. The range of parameters where phase diagrams of type C is found is substantially reduced in the present calculations, compared to earlier mean-field calculations [4,7].

The article is organized as follows: In section II the CHS hamiltonian is rewritten in terms of several spin-1 Ising variables on each site. In section III an exact mapping of the model onto an ordinary spin-1 model with temperature-dependent (effective) multispin couplings is developed. The connection between the CHS model and the spin-1 model of Schick and Shih [13] is also discussed. In sections IV and V standard mean-field theory is applied to the effective spin-1 model. Results from Monte Carlo simulations are presented in section VI. In section VII the resulting phase diagrams are discussed and compared with phase diagrams obtained in related works.

II. THE MODEL

Each site in a hypercubic d -dimensional lattice is occupied by oil, water or surfactant. The surfactant can take $2d$ different orientations along the lattice directions. This gives a total of $2 + 2d$ states for each site.

The hamiltonian may be written in terms of $1 + d$ spin-1 Ising variables per site: σ and τ^{x_i} , where x_i is a lattice direction. $\sigma = \pm 1$ represents oil/water, $\sigma = 0$ surfactant, and the τ 's different surfactant directions. Note that these variables are *dependent* since one, and

only one, of the variables at a given site will take a nonzero value. This gives again a total of $2 + 2d$ states.

For simplicity it is assumed that the hamiltonian is symmetric with respect to interchanging oil with water and flipping the surfactant ends, ie $\sigma \rightarrow -\sigma$ and $\tau \rightarrow -\tau$. To be able to regulate the oil/water concentration ratio, the hamiltonian must in addition include an unsymmetric field term. If we include nearest-neighbor interactions only, and exclude direction dependent surfactant-surfactant interactions, the most general form of the hamiltonian is:

$$\mathcal{H} = - \sum_i \left(H\sigma_i + \mu\sigma_i^2 \right) - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \left(J\sigma_i\sigma_j + K\sigma_i^2\sigma_j^2 + A \left(\sigma_i\tau_j^{x_{ij}^{\parallel}} - \tau_i^{x_{ij}^{\parallel}}\sigma_j \right) \right). \quad (1)$$

Here the first sum runs over all sites, while the second sum runs over all pairs $\langle ij \rangle$ of nearest-neighbor sites, and $x_{ij}^{\parallel}$ is the lattice direction parallel with the bond $\langle ij \rangle$. The physical significance of the parameters in the hamiltonian are: H regulates the oil/water concentration ratio. μ regulates the surfactant density. $J > 0$ ensures that oil and water do not mix at low temperatures, and will be used as a temperature scale. K is the isotropic surfactant-surfactant interaction, I will assume $K \geq 0$. A is the surfactant strength, the sign of A is physically irrelevant. Note the antisymmetric form of the A -term, this reflects the amphiphilic nature of the surfactant (ie. that one end loves water and the other end loves oil). This term is the only term in the hamiltonian that is new compared with a simple hamiltonian for a three-component system with isotropic interactions.

The hamiltonian has in other work [1,2,3,4,5,6,7] been formulated in terms of the oil-oil (water-water) energy, $-b$, the oil-surfactant energy, $\pm c$, and the chemical potentials for oil, μ_1 , water, μ_2 , and surfactant, $\mu_3 = \mu_4 = \mu_5 = \mu_6 = \mu_s$. The correspondence between the parameters in the hamiltonian (1) above and the parameters b , c , μ_1 , μ_2 , and μ_s , is as follows:

$$H = \frac{1}{2}(\mu_1 - \mu_2)$$

$$J = \frac{1}{2}b$$

$$A = c \tag{2}$$

$$\mu = \mu_s - \frac{1}{2}(\mu_1 + \mu_2)$$

$$K = \frac{1}{2}b$$

The ground states, and $T = 0$ phase diagram, of the model have been previously analyzed for the $K = J$ case [2], and for all $K > -J$ the structure is the same. This is summarized in figure 2.

The present spin-language formulation may not be appropriate if direction dependent surfactant–surfactant interactions are important, since the inclusion of such terms will complicate the hamiltonian (1) substantially.

It should be noted that the purpose of the present lattice model is not to accurately model the phase diagram of the real oil–water–surfactant system. A simple model of this type does not even model the *two component* (oil–water) system correctly: Due to the complexity of the oil–oil, water–water and oil–water interactions a temperature-dependent coupling J is needed to reproduce the important property called reentrant solubility, [11,12] i.e. that at fixed concentration oil and water mixes at high temperatures, and phase separates below a certain temperature, but mixes again in a range of lower temperatures. This stems from the complex nature of the bonds which can be in one of several van der Waals and hydrogen bonding states. Moreover, oil and water are certainly not symmetric in their surfactant interactions. The aim is rather to study the simplest possible model to be able to isolate the basic ingredients that are necessary to reproduce the key properties of real microemulsions.

III. CORRESPONDENCE WITH SPIN-1 ISING MODEL

The CHS model is closely related to two other lattice models proposed for microemulsion systems. One of these is the model proposed by Matsen and Sullivan [14,15] which is a generalization of the CHS model. The other is the spin–1 Ising model proposed by Schick and Shih [13] and studied in a series of subsequent papers [10,11,16,17,18,19]. In the following I will call this model the Schick model.

It is clear from the form of the hamiltonian (1) that the Schick model and the CHS model are closely related since both are extensions of the basic spin-1 Blume-Emery-Griffith (BEG) model:

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{BEG}} = - \sum_i \left(H \sigma_i + \mu \sigma_i^2 \right) - \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \left(J \sigma_i \sigma_j + K \sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2 \right) . \quad (3)$$

In the Schick model, the microemulsion character arises from an additional three particle interaction $L \sigma_i (1 - \sigma_j^2) \sigma_k$, where the sites ijk are neighbors on a line. The CHS model is more “realistic” with directed surfactants and pair interactions. As long as no direction dependent surfactant-surfactant interactions are included in the CHS model, the directional degrees of freedom can be summed out independently on each site resulting in an effective spin-1 hamiltonian of the Schick type with temperature-dependent multiple site couplings [11,20,21]. Hence, there exist an exact mapping between the CHS model and an extended version of the Schick model. Below, this mapping is explicitly calculated for the one dimensional version of the CHS model. The explicit expression for the effective hamiltonian in two dimensions is given in appendix A.

The CHS hamiltonian (1) has the following symmetries that also must be valid for the effective spin-1 hamiltonian:

- A global spin flip $\sigma \rightarrow -\sigma$, $H \rightarrow -H$ $\tau \rightarrow -\tau$, which implies that all terms must be even in σ operators.
- Point group operations (In one dimension limited to reflections around a point).

Summing out the surfactant directions on site i gives rise to terms proportional to $(1 - \sigma_i^2)$ and involving the σ ’s on the neighboring sites. In one dimension, four terms of this type are consistent with the above symmetries:

$$\begin{aligned} & X_0 (1 - \sigma_i^2) \\ & X_1 (1 - \sigma_i^2) (\sigma_{i-1}^2 + \sigma_{i+1}^2) \\ & X_2 (1 - \sigma_i^2) \sigma_{i-1} \sigma_{i+1} \\ & X_3 (1 - \sigma_i^2) \sigma_{i-1}^2 \sigma_{i+1}^2 \end{aligned} . \quad (4)$$

X_2 corresponds to L in the original Schick hamiltonian. Considering triplets of sites, the following four equations emerge from summing out the directional degree of freedom at the central cite,

$$\exp(-\beta\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}}) = \sum_{\tau} \exp(-\beta\mathcal{H}) , \quad (5)$$

with $\beta = 1/k_{\text{B}}T$, T temperature, and k_{B} the Boltzmann constant:

$$\begin{aligned} \oplus - \odot - \oplus : \quad X_2 + X_3 + 2X_1 + X_0 &= -k_{\text{B}}T \ln 2 \\ \ominus - \odot - \oplus : \quad -X_2 + X_3 + 2X_1 + X_0 &= -k_{\text{B}}T \ln(e^{2\beta A} + e^{-2\beta A}) \\ \odot - \odot - \oplus : \quad X_1 + X_0 &= -k_{\text{B}}T \ln(e^{\beta A} + e^{-\beta A}) \\ \odot - \odot - \odot : \quad X_0 &= -k_{\text{B}}T \ln 2 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Here the symbols $\ominus$, $\odot$, and $\oplus$ represent $\sigma = -1$, $\sigma = 0$, and $\sigma = +1$, respectively. Solving the linear equations (6) is trivial:

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &= -k_{\text{B}}T \ln 2 \\ X_1 &= -A - k_{\text{B}}T \ln(1 + e^{-2\beta A}) \\ X_2 &= A + \frac{1}{2}k_{\text{B}}T \ln(1 + e^{-4\beta A}) \\ X_3 &= A - \frac{1}{2}k_{\text{B}}T \ln\left(\frac{1 + e^{-4\beta A}}{(1 + e^{-2\beta A})^4}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Note that the term proportional to X_1 in (4) splits into a single-site term and a pair term, and the term proportional to X_0 splits into a constant and a single-site term. Thus, in one dimension the effective spin-1 hamiltonian is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = \sum_i & (-H\sigma_i - (\mu + X_0 - 2X_1)\sigma_i^2 - J\sigma_i\sigma_{i+1} - (K + 2X_1)\sigma_i^2\sigma_{i+1}^2 \\ & + (1 - \sigma_i^2)(X_2\sigma_{i-1}\sigma_{i+1} + X_3\sigma_{i-1}^2\sigma_{i+1}^2) + X_0) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This hamiltonian has an extra three-spin interaction, $X_3\sigma_{i-1}^2(1 - \sigma_i^2)\sigma_{i+1}^2$, compared with the original Schick hamiltonian, and in higher dimensions even more interactions must be included.

In the above expressions for the effective couplings (equations 7 and 37), the first term is the zero-temperature value, and the temperature dependence is isolated in the second term.

With exception of the entropic single-site X_0 coupling, all the effective couplings have a simple monotonous temperature dependence, and tend to zero with increasing temperature. Since the temperature behavior of the effective couplings in the CHS $\rightarrow$ Schick mapping is rather trivial, many qualitative features of the CHS model are probably preserved when one considers a spin-1 model with temperature independent couplings. Note, however, the nontrivial behavior of the nearest neighbor $\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2$ coupling, $(K + 2X_1)$, in the spin-1 hamiltonian (equation 8). For $A > K/2$ the coupling is negative at low temperatures, and changes sign with increasing temperature.

The CHS model may be applied to the two component oil-surfactant (or water-surfactant) system ($H \rightarrow \pm\infty$), and contains all the necessary ingredients to get a microemulsion like phase where water rich regions are separated by surfactant bilayers [6]. In a study of this system using the Schick model [11], a four-site interaction was added to get the bilayer structure. The present calculation in one dimension indicates that it may be possible to model the bilayer structure with a spin-1 hamiltonian using two- and three-site interactions only. The important ingredient is probably the nontrivial $\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2$ coupling mentioned above.

IV. MF THEORY OF THE EFFECTIVE HAMILTONIAN

In this section standard mean-field theory is applied to the two-dimensional version of the effective hamiltonian of section III. In earlier work [3,4,5,7] mean-field theory was applied to the CHS hamiltonian (1) directly, and I expect that the present approach will improve on these results.

The starting point of mean-field theory is to express the energy and entropy per spin as functionals of the magnetization, $m = \langle \sigma \rangle$ ($\langle \dots \rangle$ represents thermal average), and surfactant density, $\rho_s = \langle 1 - \sigma^2 \rangle$, by assuming that the probabilities of the different states are uncorrelated at different sites. For *homogeneous phases* (all sites equivalent) the mean-field energy per site, e , is

$$e = -Hm - 2Jm^2 - (1 - \rho_s)\mu - 2K(1 - \rho_s)^2 +$$

$$\begin{aligned} & (X_0 + 4X_1(1 - \rho_s) + 2X_2m^2 + 6X_3(1 - \rho_s)^2 + 4X_6m^2(1 - \rho_s) + \\ & 4X_8(1 - \rho_s)^3 + X_9m^4 + 2X_{10}m^2(1 - \rho_s)^2 + X_{12}(1 - \rho_s)^4) \rho_s, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the effective couplings, X_n , are given by equation 37. The entropy per site, s , takes the simple form

$$s/k_B = -\frac{1 - m - \rho_s}{2} \ln\left(\frac{1 - m - \rho_s}{2}\right) - \frac{1 + m - \rho_s}{2} \ln\left(\frac{1 + m - \rho_s}{2}\right) - \rho_s \ln(\rho_s). \quad (10)$$

Note that when mean-field theory is applied to the CHS hamiltonian directly, the equivalents of equations 9 and 10 are *independent* of the surfactant strength A . Hence the part of the phase diagram that pertains to homogeneous phases, ie disordered to oil/water co-existence transitions and tricritical point, is totally insensitive to the surfactant strength in that approximation. The present approach removes this artifact.

The free energy at a given field, H , and chemical potential, μ , $f(\beta, \mu, H)$, is found by minimizing $f(\beta, \mu, H; \rho_s, m) = e - \beta^{-1}(s/k_B)$ with respect to ρ_s and m . Thus, the partial derivatives of f with respect to m and ρ_s must vanish:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial m} &= -H - 4Jm + (4X_2m + 4X_9m^3 + 8X_6m(1 - \rho_s) + 4X_{10}m(1 - \rho_s)^2) \rho_s \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\beta} \ln\left(\frac{1 - m - \rho_s}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{2\beta} \ln\left(\frac{1 + m - \rho_s}{2}\right) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \rho_s} &= \mu + X_0 + 4X_1(1 - 2\rho_s) + 2X_2m^2 + 6X_3(1 - 3\rho_s)(1 - \rho_s) \\ &\quad + 4X_6m^2(1 - 2\rho_s) + 4X_8(1 - \rho_s)^2(1 - 4\rho_s) + X_9m^4 \\ &\quad + 2X_{10}m^2(1 - 3\rho_s)(1 - \rho_s) + X_{12}(1 - \rho_s)^3(1 - 5\rho_s) + 4K(1 - \rho_s) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\beta} \ln\left(\frac{1 - m - \rho_s}{2}\right) - \frac{1}{2\beta} \ln\left(\frac{1 + m - \rho_s}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{\beta} \ln(\rho_s) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The m and ρ_s that satisfy these equations will be the equilibrium values for m and ρ_s . There may be several solutions, and the solution that gives the lowest free energy yields the equilibrium values.

By symmetry the critical line, separating the high-temperature disordered phase from the low-temperature oil- *or* water-rich phase, is found at $H = m = 0$, where equation 11 is trivially satisfied. Thus, only equation (12) is important for the localization of the critical line. At the critical line the minimum changes into a maximum. The minimal eigenvalue of the matrix of second partial derivatives of f must therefore vanish. In the present case the matrix has a very simple form: the nondiagonal elements vanish, and the diagonal element $(\partial^2 f / \partial \rho_s^2)$ is always larger than the element $(\partial^2 f / \partial m^2)$. Hence, the critical line is defined by the vanishing of the latter:

$$-4J + \frac{1}{\beta(1 - \rho_s)} + \left(4X_2 + 8X_6(1 - \rho_s) + 4X_{10}(1 - \rho_s)^2\right) \rho_s = 0 \quad (13)$$

This critical condition is independent of the chemical potential, μ , and it is therefore, for given interaction strengths and temperature, an equation for ρ_s . The equation is a fourth order polynomial equation, and of the four solutions, only one is physically acceptable (ρ_s real, and $0 < \rho_s < 1$). This solution is the critical density, $\rho_s^{\text{crit}}(T)$. The surfactant density and chemical potential are connected by equation 12 giving the critical chemical potential

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{\text{crit}}(T; \rho_s) = & -4K(1 - \rho_s) - X_0 - 4X_1(1 - 2\rho_s) - 6X_3(1 - 3\rho_s)(1 - \rho_s) \\ & - 4X_8(1 - \rho_s)^2(1 - 4\rho_s) - X_{12}(1 - \rho_s)^3(1 - 5\rho_s) \\ & + \frac{1}{\beta} \ln\left(\frac{1 - \rho_s}{2\rho_s}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The phase transition is not always continuous. For low temperatures it changes to first order at a tricritical point, below which the free energy may be lowered near the “critical” line, as defined by equations (13) and (14), by an infinitesimal displacement $(m, \delta\rho_s) = (\epsilon, a\epsilon^2)$, ie a *quadratic* relation between $\delta\rho_s$ and m ($\delta\rho_s \sim m^2$). All odd partial derivatives with respect to m vanish by symmetry, and close to the critical line the free energy functional is then:

$$\begin{aligned} f(m, \delta\rho_s) = & f(0, 0) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \rho_s^2} \right) \delta\rho_s^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial m^2 \partial \rho_s} \right) m^2 \delta\rho_s + \frac{1}{24} \left(\frac{\partial^4 f}{\partial m^4} \right) m^4 + \mathcal{O}(m^6) \\ = & f(0, 0) + \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \rho_s^2} \right) a^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial m^2 \partial \rho_s} \right) a + \frac{1}{24} \left(\frac{\partial^4 f}{\partial m^4} \right) \right] m^4 + \mathcal{O}(m^6) \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The tricritical point is the point where, coming from higher temperatures, it is first possible to find an a such that the term in square brackets ([]) in this equation (15) vanishes. This defines the equation

$$\left(\frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial m^2 \partial \rho_s}\right)^2 - \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{\partial^4 f}{\partial m^4}\right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \rho_s^2}\right) = 0 \quad (16)$$

with

$$\left(\frac{\partial^3 f}{\partial m^2 \partial \rho_s}\right) = \frac{1}{\beta (1 - \rho_s)^2} + 4X_2 + 8X_6 (1 - 2\rho_s) + 4X_{10} (1 - 3\rho_s) (1 - \rho_s) \quad (17)$$

$$\left(\frac{\partial^4 f}{\partial m^4}\right) = \frac{2}{\beta (1 - \rho_s)^3} + 24X_9 \rho_s \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \rho_s^2}\right) &= \frac{1}{\beta (1 - \rho_s) \rho_s} - 4K - 8X_1 - 12X_3 (2 - 3\rho_s) \\ &\quad - 24X_8 (1 - \rho_s) (1 - 2\rho_s) - 4X_{12} (1 - \rho_s)^2 (2 - 5\rho_s) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

to be satisfied at the tricritical point in addition to equation 13. The tricritical density, ρ_{s3} , and temperature, T_3 , as a function of surfactant strength, A , and of the parameter K are given in figure 3. The Lifshitz point is calculated in section V. Note that in earlier mean-field calculations [4,7] the position of the tricritical point was independent of A , and the phase diagram was always of type C for large A . In the present calculation this type of phase diagram is found in an intermediate A range only, and only for $K \approx 0$. For a sufficiently strong surfactant the phase diagram is always of type B.

V. CORRELATIONS IN HIGH-TEMPERATURE PHASE FROM MF-THEORY

The connection between the free energy functional and the spatial correlations is textbook material [22], and has previously been applied to mean-field theories of microemulsion models [4,5,7,10,23]:

While the equilibrium values of the fields (m and ρ_s) are the same at all sites, the *fluctuations* are not homogeneous. Expanding to lowest (second) order in the fluctuations, δm and $\delta \rho_s$, the free energy takes the form

$$F = F_0(m, \rho_s) + \sum_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} \phi_{\mathbf{n}} \Phi(\mathbf{d}) \phi_{\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{d}}^T \quad (20)$$

with

$$\Phi(\mathbf{d}) = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{mm}(\mathbf{d}) & \Phi_{m\rho_s}(\mathbf{d}) \\ \Phi_{\rho_sm}(\mathbf{d}) & \Phi_{\rho_s\rho_s}(\mathbf{d}) \end{pmatrix} \quad (21)$$

and

$$\phi_{\mathbf{n}} = (\delta m_{\mathbf{n}}, \delta \rho_{s\mathbf{n}}) \quad (22)$$

The Fourier transformed correlation function can then be expressed as

$$H(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{(2\pi)^2}{\beta} \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{k}) \quad (23)$$

In the present short-range model $\Phi(\mathbf{k})$ is a finite sum over near neighbor terms. We are primarily interested in the zero field model ($H = 0$) where $m = 0$. Here $\Phi(\mathbf{k})$ is diagonal (non-diagonal elements are proportional to m) with the elements:

$$\Phi_{mm}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{\beta(1 - \rho_s)} \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & -2J (\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y)) \\ & + \left(2X_2 + 4X_6 (1 - \rho_s) + 2X_{10}(1 - \rho_s)^2 \right) \rho_s (\cos(2k_x) + \cos(2k_y)) \end{aligned}$$

$$\Phi_{\rho_s\rho_s}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{\beta(1 - \rho_s) \rho_s} \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & - \left(2K + 4X_1 + 12X_3 (1 - \rho_s) + \right. \\ & \quad \left. 12X_8(1 - \rho_s)^2 + 4X_{12}(1 - \rho_s)^3 \right) (\cos(k_x) + \cos(k_y)) \\ & + \left(2X_3 + 4X_8 (1 - \rho_s) + 2X_{12}(1 - \rho_s)^2 \right) \rho_s (\cos(2k_x) + \cos(2k_y)) \\ & + (4X_3 + 8X_{12} (1 - \rho_s)) \rho_s (\cos(k_x - k_y) + \cos(k_x + k_y)) \end{aligned}$$

A detailed discussion of the form of these correlations, and comparison with experimental and Monte Carlo scattering functions, and other theoretical work, is deferred to a separate paper.

A. The Lifshitz line

The competition between the $\cos(k)$ -term (proportional to the water–water interaction, J) and the $\cos(2k)$ -term (proportional to the surfactant density, ρ_s) in $\Phi_{mm}(\mathbf{k})$ (equation 24) is the origin of a maximum in the correlation function, $H_{mm}(\mathbf{k})$, at $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$ in parts of the phase diagram. This maximum is an experimental characteristic of microemulsions, and its location determines the characteristic length scale for the microemulsion structure. The maximum is located on the diagonal ($k_x = k_y = k_{\max}$):

$$\cos(k_{\max}) = \frac{J}{\left(4X_2 + 8X_6(1 - \rho_s) + 4X_{10}(1 - \rho_s)^2\right)\rho_s} \quad (26)$$

The Lifshitz line separates the region of the phase diagram where the correlation function has a maximum at $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$ (microemulsion) from the region with a maximum at $\mathbf{k} = 0$ (ordinary fluid). Note that no phase transition occurs at this line. The Lifshitz line satisfies the equation

$$\cos(k_{\max}) = 1. \quad (27)$$

B. Phase transition from disordered to incommensurate

Critical behavior is recognized by divergencies in the correlations, i.e. by zeros in $\Phi(\mathbf{k})$. The disorder–oil/water critical line (equation 13) is recovered as $\Phi_{mm}(0) = 0$, while divergencies at $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$ signal a possible continuous transition into an incommensurate phase (ordered structured phase where the order is incommensurate with the underlying lattice). In this section I *assume* that the transition is continuous. There is no real justification for this assumption, and the transition will most probably be first order in at least part of the phase diagram [7,8].

The transition will take place at $\mathbf{k} = (k_{\max}, k_{\max})$ (equation 26), and for a diagonal $\mathbf{k}$ the equation $\Phi_{mm}(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ is quadratic in $\cos(k)$. In different regions of the phase diagram the solutions to this equation fall into one of three classes:

1) Two complex conjugate solutions: No maximum at $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$.

2) Two real solutions: $\Phi_{mm}(\mathbf{k}) < 0$ for some $\mathbf{k}$. This is unphysical and the system must be in an ordered phase.

3) A single real solution: Divergence at $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$, i.e. critical line.

Using the criterion for class 3 above, the line of continuous phase transitions into an incommensurate phase satisfies the equation

$$b^2 - 8c(a - c) = 0 \quad (28)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \frac{1}{\beta(1 - \rho_s)} \\ b &= 4J \\ c &= 4\rho_s \left(X_2 + 2X_6(1 - \rho_s) + X_{10}(1 - \rho_s)^2 \right) = \frac{J}{\cos(k_{\max})} \end{aligned}$$

VI. MONTE CARLO SIMULATION

The model has been simulated using a standard Metropolis Monte Carlo method. The lattice is divided into three sublattices to enable vectorization, in a manner very similar to the partition used by Wansleben et al [24,25], but no multispin coding is used. The random number generator employed is a shift-register generator with a very long period ($2^{607} - 1$), which is never exhausted in a MC run (For a discussion of random generators of this type, see the paper of Compagner and Hoogland [26] and references therein). The program generates $\approx 10^6$ spin-flip trials per second on a CRAY X-MP. To simplify (and speed up) the program, I have only simulated the $K = 0$, version of the hamiltonian (1).

Detailed Monte Carlo studies have been performed for the $K = 0$, $A = 3J$ model only.

Standard finite size scaling techniques was used to locate the critical line [27]. This includes scaling of the magnetization (m), susceptibility (χ_m), and fourth order cumulant, (U_m):

$$m = \left| \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_i \sigma_i \right| \quad (29)$$

$$\chi_m = \langle m^2 \rangle - \langle m \rangle^2 \quad (30)$$

$$U_m = 1 - \frac{\langle m^4 \rangle}{3 \langle m^2 \rangle^2} \quad (31)$$

L is the linear size of the lattice. Since all the critical exponents are exactly known (the order-disorder transition is in the universality class of the two-dimensional Ising model) there is only one parameter, the critical temperature, T_c , to be fitted in all these scaling laws:

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{m}(\tau) &= L^{1/8} m(\tau) \\ \widetilde{\chi}_m(\tau) &= L^{-7/4} \chi_m(\tau) \\ \widetilde{U}_m(\tau) &= U_m(\tau) \\ \tau &= \left(\frac{T - T_c}{T_c} \right) L \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

As is evident from figure 4 finite size scaling works well for all scaling functions, with a unique critical temperature.

The next question to be answered is whether the phase transition changes into first order at a tricritical point, as is the case in the mean-field phase diagrams calculated above. The Monte Carlo results show pronounced hysteresis at low temperatures, but this is definitely not conclusive, and especially not so in this particular model, since the tricritical temperature is very low. More convincing is the fact that the susceptibility, χ_s , of the noncritical surfactant density, ρ_s

$$\rho_s = \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_i (1 - \sigma_i^2) \quad (33)$$

$$\chi_s = \langle \rho_s \rho_s \rangle - \langle \rho_s \rangle^2 \quad (34)$$

at the critical line obeys finite size scaling using the tricritical exponents relevant for the model [28] (Universality class of a one component order parameter in two dimensions, ie tricritical spin-1 Ising model):

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\chi}_s(\tau) &= L^{-\gamma_t/\nu_t} \chi_s(\tau) \\ \tau &= \left(\frac{\mu - \mu_3}{\mu_3} \right) L^{1/\nu_t}\end{aligned}\tag{35}$$

or

$$\tau = \left(\frac{T - T_3}{T_3} \right) L^{1/\nu_t}$$

with $\nu_t = 5/9$ and $\gamma_t = 37/36$. Tricritical finite size plots are shown in figure 5. The resulting tricritical point for $K = 0$ and $A = 3J$ is $k_B T_3/J = 0.52 \pm 0.03$ and $\mu_3/J = 3.15 \pm 0.1$.

The Monte Carlo estimates for points along the line of continuous oil/water $\rightarrow$ disordered transitions, and of the tricritical point, for $A = 3.0J$ and $K = 0$ are included in figure 6. The present calculation is inconsistent with earlier Monte Carlo calculations by Laradji et al [8], which gave critical temperature estimates that are about a factor 1.4 higher than the present estimates. I have no explanation for the discrepancy, but tend to believe that the present estimates are better than the estimates of Laradji et al. The reason for this is that in the present calculation the critical temperature is always lower than the pure Ising ($\mu = \infty$) value. This is not the case in the calculations of Laradji et al. Normally the presence of surfactants will counteract ferromagnetic order, as it does in the $A = 0$ model [29], and it is difficult to see how it could promote such order.

It was not possible to get conclusive results on the nature of the d $\rightarrow$ i (disordered- to ordered structured phase) transition. I will therefore not rule out completely the possibility that a first-order d $\rightarrow$ i line crosses the critical line at a higher temperature than the tricritical point found above. The model becomes very difficult to study with the present algorithm close to the tricritical point. In the order of $> 10^6$ whole lattice sweeps were necessary to get reasonable statistics at the points simulated, and the finite size plots in figure 4 represents ≈ 20 hours of Cray CPU-time. The dynamics grows slower as the tricritical point is approached. The reason for the slow dynamics seems to be that the activity is limited to oil/surfactant/water interfaces while most of the system lies within homogeneous oil or water regions.

VII. CONCLUSION

Representative phase diagrams are shown in figures 6 and 7. Except for weak surfactant, the phase diagrams are all of type B, and include an oil/water/microemulsion coexistence region. This typical behavior was also found in studies of the Schick model [10,18,19], and this supports the claim in section III that this simpler model preserves the important physical properties of the CHS model. The previous simple mean-field result [4,5,7] that the phase diagram is always of type C for strong surfactant, seems to be an artifact of the approximation employed.

Results from Monte Carlo simulations are consistent with the phase diagram topologies found from mean-field theory, but the results are not conclusive. The quantitative error in the location of the mean-field critical and tricritical temperatures is of the order expected in two dimensions. Note that the tricritical temperature found here in the simulations on the $K = 0$, $A = 3J$ model, $k_B T_3/J = 0.52 \pm 0.03$ is lower than the tricritical temperature for the $K = 0$, $A = 0$ model [30], $k_B T_3/J = 0.610 \pm 0.005$. This confirms the mean-field result that T_3 initially decreases with larger A (see figure 3). The critical and tricritical surfactant densities found in the Monte Carlo simulations are much lower than the corresponding mean-field densities. The amount of surfactant necessary to make oil and water miscible is thus much lower than what mean-field theory predicts. For the $K = 0$, $A = 3J$ model the tricritical density is $\rho_{s3}^{\text{MC}} \approx 0.06$ compared with the mean-field result $\rho_{s3}^{\text{MF}} = 0.2$, and the A independent $K = 0$ tricritical density $\rho_{s3}^{\text{MF}'} = 2/3$ of mean-field theory applied to the CHS hamiltonian directly is totally off the mark. The Monte Carlo results are compatible with experimental microemulsion systems where the amount of surfactant is typically a few percent. Notice also (figure 6) that the MC critical line is almost vertical (constant ρ_s) over a wide range of temperatures near the tricritical point. This feature is not shared by the mean-field critical line which has an almost constant slope for all temperatures.

The present study strengthen previous results on the same model that the decisive microscopic ingredient for microemulsion behavior is the amphiphilic nature of the surfactant.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Norwegian Council for Science and the Humanities (NAVF) is acknowledged for financial support and CPU-time on the Cray X-MP at the supercomputing center in Trondheim. Several discussions with professor J. S. Høye have given valuable contributions to the present work.

In two dimensions the new effective interactions resulting from the summing out of the surfactant directions at a site i involve the factor $(1 - \sigma_i^2)$ and all combinations of σ and σ^2 on i 's next neighbor sites that are compatible with the symmetries of the CHS hamiltonian. Labeling the central site σ_0 and numbering its nearest neighbor spins $\sigma_1 \dots \sigma_4$ in the clockwise direction, these combinations are:

$$\begin{aligned}
& X_0(1 - \sigma_0^2) \\
& X_1(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2 + \sigma_3^2 + \sigma_4^2) \\
& X_2(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1\sigma_3 + \sigma_2\sigma_4) \\
& X_3(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1^2\sigma_3^2 + \sigma_2^2\sigma_4^2) \\
& X_4(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1\sigma_2 + \sigma_2\sigma_3 + \sigma_3\sigma_4 + \sigma_4\sigma_1) \\
& X_5(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1^2\sigma_2^2 + \sigma_2^2\sigma_3^2 + \sigma_3^2\sigma_4^2 + \sigma_4^2\sigma_1^2) \\
& X_6(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1\sigma_3(\sigma_2^2 + \sigma_4^2) + \sigma_2\sigma_4(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_3^2)) \\
& X_7(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1\sigma_2(\sigma_3^2 + \sigma_4^2) + \sigma_2\sigma_3(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_4^2) + \sigma_3\sigma_4(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_2^2) + \sigma_4\sigma_1(\sigma_2^2 + \sigma_3^2)) \\
& X_8(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1^2\sigma_3^2(\sigma_2^2 + \sigma_4^2) + \sigma_2^2\sigma_4^2(\sigma_1^2 + \sigma_3^2)) \\
& X_9(1 - \sigma_0^2)\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3\sigma_4 \\
& X_{10}(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1\sigma_2^2\sigma_3\sigma_4^2 + \sigma_1^2\sigma_2\sigma_3^2\sigma_4) \\
& X_{11}(1 - \sigma_0^2)(\sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_3^2\sigma_4^2 + \sigma_1^2\sigma_2\sigma_3\sigma_4^2 + \sigma_1^2\sigma_2^2\sigma_3\sigma_4 + \sigma_1\sigma_2^2\sigma_3^2\sigma_4) \\
& X_{12}(1 - \sigma_0^2)\sigma_1^2\sigma_2^2\sigma_3^2\sigma_4^2
\end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Considering configurations of four spins around a central surfactant, the summing out of the surfactant directions leads to a set of linear equations for the effective couplings, X_n . Solving these equations gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
X_0 &= -k_B T \ln 4 \\
X_1 &= -A + 2k_B T \ln\left(\frac{2}{1 + e^{-\beta A}}\right) \\
X_2 &= A - k_B T \ln\left(\frac{2}{1 + e^{-2\beta A}}\right) \\
X_3 &= A - k_B T \ln\left(\frac{8(1 + e^{-2\beta A})}{(1 + e^{-\beta A})^4}\right) \\
X_4 &= 0 \\
X_5 &= X_3 \\
X_6 &= -\frac{1}{2}A + \frac{1}{2}k_B T \ln\left(\frac{4(1 + e^{-2\beta A} - e^{-\beta A})}{(1 + e^{-2\beta A})^2}\right) \\
X_7 &= 0 \\
X_8 &= -\frac{3}{2}A + \frac{1}{2}k_B T \ln\left(\frac{1024(1 + e^{-2\beta A})^6}{(1 + e^{-2\beta A} - e^{-\beta A})(1 + e^{-\beta A})^{16}}\right) \\
X_9 &= \frac{1}{2}A - \frac{1}{4}k_B T \ln\left(\frac{8(1 + e^{-4\beta A})}{(1 + e^{-2\beta A})^4}\right) \\
X_{10} &= \frac{1}{2}A - \frac{1}{4}k_B T \ln\left(\frac{32(1 + e^{-2\beta A} - e^{-\beta A})^4}{(1 + e^{-4\beta A})(1 + e^{-2\beta A})^4}\right) \\
X_{11} &= 0 \\
X_{12} &= \frac{5}{2}A - \frac{1}{4}k_B T \ln\left(\frac{2^{35}(1 + e^{-4\beta A})(1 + e^{-2\beta A})^{28}}{(1 + e^{-2\beta A} - e^{-\beta A})^8(1 + e^{-\beta A})^{64}}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Ciach, J. S. Høye and G. Stell. J. Phys. A **21** L777 (1988)
- [2] A. Ciach, J. S. Høye and G. Stell. J. Chem. Phys. **90** 1214 (1989)
- [3] A. Ciach and J. S. Høye. J. Chem. Phys. **90** 1222 (1989)
- [4] A. Ciach. J. Chem. Phys. **93** 5322 (1990)
- [5] A. Ciach, J. S. Høye and G. Stell. J. Chem. Phys. **95** 5300 (1991)
- [6] L. Renlie, J. S. Høye, M. S. Skaf and G. Stell. J. Chem. Phys. **95** 5305 (1991)
- [7] A. Ciach. J. Chem. Phys. **96** 1399 (1992)
- [8] M. Laradji, H. Guo, M. Grant, and M. J. Zuckermann. Phys. Rev. A **44** 8184 (1991)
- [9] R. M. Hornreich, R. Liebman, H. G. Schuster, and W. Selke. Z. Phys. B **35** 91 (1979)
- [10] G. Gompper and M. Schick. Phys. Rev. B **41** 9148 (1990)
- [11] G. Gompper and M. Schick. Chem. Phys. Lett. **163** 475 (1989)
- [12] R. E. Goldstein. J. Chem. Phys. **83** 1246 (1985)
- [13] M. Schick and Wei-Heng Shih. Phys. Rev. Lett. **59** 1205 (1987)
- [14] M. W. Matsen and D. E. Sullivan. Phys. Rev. A **41** 2021 (1990)
- [15] M. W. Matsen and D. E. Sullivan. Phys. Rev. A **44** 3710 (1991)
- [16] M. Schick and Wei-Heng Shih. Phys. Rev. B **34** 1797 (1986)
- [17] G. Gompper and M. Schick. Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** 1647 (1989)
- [18] G. Gompper and M. Schick. Phys. Rev. A **42** 2137 (1990)
- [19] M. Schick. Physica A **172** 200 (1991)
- [20] S. Alexander. J. Phys. (Paris) Lett. **39** L-1 (1978)

- [21] J. W. Halley and A. J. Kolan. J. Chem. Phys **88**, 3313 (1988)
- [22] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz: *Statistical Physics* 3rd Edition Part 1. p. 350. Pergamon Press 1980.
- [23] B. Widom. J. Chem. Phys. **90** 2437 (1989)
- [24] S. Wansleben, J. G. Zabolitzky and C. Kalle. J. Stat. Phys. **37** 271 (1984)
- [25] S. Wansleben. Comp. Phys. Comm. **43** 9 (1987)
- [26] A. Compagner and A. Hoogland. J. Comp. Phys. **71** 391 (1987)
- [27] K. Binder and D. W. Heermann. *Monte Carlo simulation in statistical physics*. Springer 1988.
- [28] I. D. Lawrie and S. Sarbach. in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena* vol. 9 ed. C. Domb and J. L. Lebowitz. p. 1. Academic Press 1984.
- [29] W. Selke and J. Yeomans. J. Phys. A **16** 2789 (1983)
- [30] P. D. Beale Phys. Rev. B **33** 1717 (1986)

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Types of phase diagrams that is expected in the CHS-model [4,7]. T is temperature, and μ is the surfactant chemical potential. type A, (a), is relevant for a weak surfactant: two regions, disordered (d) and oil/water coexistence (o-w) is separated by a continuous phase transition (full line) which changes into first order (dashed line) at a tricritical point. With a strong surfactant, the phase diagram is either of type B, (b), or type C, (c). Both these diagrams show four regions: disordered (d), microemulsion (m), oil/water coexistence (o-w), and ordered structured phases (i), which may be incommensurate with the underlying lattice.

FIG. 2. Ground states, and $T = 0$ phase diagram of CHS-model in two dimensions. The model has three different ground states: All oil or water (F), all surfactant (S), layered (L), and tubular (T). The layered and tubular states, correspond to ordered structured phases (i) in the $T \neq 0$ phase diagrams of figures 1, 6, and 7.

FIG. 3. Tricritical density, ρ_{s3} , (top) and temperature, T_3 , (bottom) as a function of surfactant strength, A , with $K = 0.0 \dots 1.0$ (Full lines). The dashed lines give the position of the Lifshitz points in regions of parameter space where the phase diagram is of type C (fig. 1).

FIG. 4. Finite size scaling plots for the magnetization, $\tilde{m} = L^{1/8}m$, fourth order cumulant, $\tilde{U}_m = U_m$, and susceptibility, $\tilde{\chi}_m = L^{-7/4}\chi_m$ as functions of scaled temperature, $\tau = L(T - T_c)/T_c$. At $K = 0$, $A = 3.0J$ and $\mu = 5.0J$, with $T_c = 1.265J$.

FIG. 5. Tricritical scaling: Finite size scaling plots for the surfactant density susceptibility, χ_s , at criticality as a function of scaled chemical potential (top) and scaled temperature (bottom). At $K = 0$ and $A = 3.0J$ with $\mu_3 = 3.15$ and $T_3 = 0.52$.

FIG. 6. Phase diagrams for $K = 0$ and three different surfactant strengths. The lines are the results of mean-field theory on the effective spin-1 hamiltonian. Full lines are continuous- and dashed lines first-order transitions. The dotted line is the Lifshitz line. Note that the line for the $d \rightarrow i$ transition is found under the assumption that the phase transition is continuous, that the region denoted by i (incommensurate) is probably divided into several different phases separated by first-order phase transitions, and that this region is separated from the $o-w$ region by a first-order transition [4,7]. This is not indicated in the figure. For comparison the (A independent) localization of the tricritical point from the application of mean-field theory on the CHS-hamiltonian directly is indicated (with a $+$). Squares are Monte Carlo results for the $d \rightarrow o-w$ transition ($A = 3.0J$ only). Error bars for the critical temperature are not shown, but are much smaller than the symbols, while the error bars for the critical surfactant density are shown. The MC tricritical point is indicated by a cross surrounded by an error rectangle ($A = 3.0J$ and top row only).

FIG. 7. Phase diagrams for $K = J$ and three different surfactant strengths. The notation follows figure 6.